

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 were examined in the Final office action mailed on 03/28/2007 (hereafter "First Final Office Action"). All claims were rejected.

By virtue of this response, claims 1, 12, 16, 21, 32, 36 and 47 are sought to be amended, and claim 48 is sought to be added. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer. The addition and amendments are believed not to introduce new matter and their entry is requested. Claims 1-48 are thus presented for reconsideration.

Telephone Interview

As noted above, a telephone interview was conducted with Examiner Basher on 15 May 2007. Examiner Basher, the undersigned representative, and Mr. VS Anand (an associate with the undersigned representative) were the participants.

The undersigned representative explained how at least the amendments sought overcome U.S. PG Pub No. US 2004/0205567, filed 1/22/2002, naming Nielsen as inventor (hereinafter Nielsen).

In particular, the undersigned representative pointed out that Nielsen does not teach or reasonably suggest the feature of "said portion identifier indicates a relative location of said first data element with respect to another data element in said data file according to said markup language" (currently amended claim 1).

In this regard, the undersigned representative noted that the portion identifier (XPath) of Nielsen identifies another node whose content is to replace the "ref:" node as described in the following portions of Nielsen:

...The algorithm involves traversing the request element (e.g., the DOM tree) in order to search for nodes or attributes with names beginning with an insertion tag (e.g., "ref:"). When nodes or attributes with the "ref:" tag are found, the contents of such nodes or attributes are treated as an XPath relative to the current node. ***This XPath leads us to another node.*** These nodes, as described above, are utilized to ***replace the "ref:" node*** with a new node based on the contents of the referenced node. ...
(Para 88 and 89 of Nielsen, ***Emphasis Added***)

The undersigned representative noted that the art of record does not teach applications receiving in association both the portion identifier and the corresponding data element from a parser after instructing the parser to parse a file. It was noted that amended claim 12 is amended accordingly.

5 The undersigned representative further noted that the art of record does not teach or reasonably suggest applications, which in particular operate with event based parsers, as claimed in claim 16.

The Examiner indicated he will need to review Nielsen carefully before reaching any conclusions.

10 The applicant is believed to have met the burden of making of record the Substance of the Interview. The Examiner is respectfully requested to send a duly completed Interview Summary form PTOL 413 if one has not been sent already. See MPEP 713.04 for further clarification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103

15 For reasons noted above, independent claims 1 and 12 are believed to be allowable over the art of record. The remaining independent claims 21, 32 and 47 are also allowable for similar reasons. The dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from allowable base claims.

Currently amended claim 16 is independently allowable also for reasons noted above.

20 The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are rendered moot at least in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

Conclusion

Thus, it is believed that all the rejections have been overcome, and applicants respectfully request their withdrawal. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned

Reply to Office Action of 03/28/2007

Appl. No.: 10/711,791

Amendment Dated: May 28, 2007 Attorney Docket No.: ORCL-006/OID-2004-061-01

representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Date: May 28, 2007

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta

Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number: 41,416